

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 are presently pending and stand rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious from Ottesen.

Examiner has indicated:

Ottesen does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations of Claim 1. Ottesen only discloses that audio/video data are decoded using a method similar to claim 1. Claim 1 requires first and second channel audio information. Ottesen does disclose in para 49 that the audio format conforms to one of many known standards. It is notoriously well known in cable systems to provide audio streams with more than one channel of sound. Stereo sound (L and R channel sound) as well as 5 or more channel sound is well known. While Ottesen isn't concerned with the number of channels used in playback, it would have been obvious to configure Ottesen's system to accommodate multiple channel sound sources.

Furthermore, Ottesen does not disclose reusing memory space allocated for the system (i.e. overwriting). However, it is notoriously well known to reuse memory space (i.e. space used by the input buffer in this case and other memories of fig. 10) in order to accommodate new data. It is desirable to configure a system in this manner in order to reduce the overall memory space needed.

Office Action at 3-4.

The remaining limitations to claim 1 that Examiner concedes that Ottsen does not explicitly disclose are:

overwriting interleaved first audio channel information with interleaved second audio channel information in the first static memory device;
de-interleaving second audio channel information;

writing de-interleaved second audio channel information to the second static memory device;
overwriting interleaved second audio channel information in the first static memory with de-interleaved first audio channel information from the dynamic memory device; and
decoding the first and second audio channel information.

Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 1 and respectfully submits that even if it was “notoriously well known in cable system to provide audio streams with more than one channel of sound” and even if it was “notoriously well known to reuse memory space ... in order to accommodate new data” it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to “overwrit[e] interleaved first audio channel information with interleaved second audio channel information” and then “overwrit[e] interleaved second audio channel information in the first static memory with deinterleaved first audio channel information”.

Examiner has proposed a modification to Ottesen that comprises:

overwriting interleaved second audio channel information in the first static memory with de- interleaved first audio channel information from the dynamic memory device (i.e. transferring the second channel data from DASD to the output buffer; Fig. 11; depending on the system memory, it is known to reallocate portions to operate and receive data dynamically depending on the program; thus it is obvious to reallocate the memory used for the input buffer to operate as the output buffer and vice versa).; and

Assignee respectfully traverse that even “transferring the second channel data from DASD to the output buffer” and even if “it is known to reallocated portions to operate and receive data dynamically depending on the program”, it would not have been obvious to “overwrit[e] interleaved second audio channel information in the first

static memory with deinterleaved first audio channel information” after “overwriting interleaved first audio channel information with interleaved second audio channel information”.

Additionally, Assignee also traverses that “it is known to reallocate portions to operate and receive data dynamically depending on the program” as Examiner has suggested and Examiner is requested to provide a reference disclosing the same.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claim 2 recites, among other limitations, “wherein the first audio channel information and the second audio channel information comprise similar audio information from adjacent sub-frames”. Although Examiner has indicated that “first and second channel audio of the television signal typically includes L and R audio, which can be considered to be substantially similar”, Ottesen does not teach “similar audio information from adjacent sub-frames”. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claim 2.

Claims 5-18 were rejected “under the same grounds as claims 1-4 as stated above.” For the reasons indicated with respect to claim 1, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 5-18. Additionally, Assignee also traverses the rejection to claims 5 and 12 because Ottesen does not teach that “first audio channel information is ... temporarily stored in the dynamic memory device”. It is respectfully submitted that even if claims 1-4 are obvious from Ottesen (which they are not), it still

Application № 10/717,418
Reply to Office Action of March 28, 2008

would not be obvious that "first audio channel information is ... temporarily stored in the dynamic memory device". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that each of the pending claims are allowable and Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees for any actions requested herein or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: June 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Mirut Dalal
Reg. No. 44,052
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100